

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 has been amended. Claims 3, 5, 8, 9 and 12-31 have been withdrawn from consideration. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has maintained from the previous Office Action mailed January 10, 2005 all of the previous rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In Applicants' previous response filed May 10, 2005, Applicants argued, regarding **Horel et al.**:

"E4" represents an electronic component, which is not necessarily a capacitor, which "can be soldered on the top surface of the adapter ring 33 between the contact hole 53' and the central ground region 46", as disclosed in column 11, lines 3-6. This is in contrast to the present invention, in which the capacitor 20 is embedded entirely within resin insulation layer 14, as shown in Fig. 4.

Claim 1 recites that the capacitor is embedded entirely within resin insulation layer 14, as shown in FIG. 4.

The Examiner disagrees with these assertions, stating:

Horel et al. disclose that electronic component "E4" is a capacitor. In col. 11, lines 35-36 it states: "... a parallel circuit from the T-shaped circuit to ground has been introduced by the 0.1 microfarad capacitor E4..." Further, the capacitor is embedded entirely in the resin layer is a matter of design choice to each individual user.

Thus, the Examiner has maintained his position that embedding a capacitor in a resin insulation layer would be obvious in view of the probe card of **Horel et al.** that carries electric elements (capacitors and resistances) on a top surface and a bottom surface of a multilayer interconnection substrate.

Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, the present invention relates to a probe card having a decoupling capacitor. In the present invention, the decoupling capacitor is embedded in a resin insulation layer constituting a buildup interconnection layer in electrical connection with a probe needle. With this construction, elimination of high frequency noise is achieved efficiently.


Horel et al. is silent about the feature of decoupling capacitor. There is no suggestion in Horel et al. to use the capacitor for the decoupling capacitor. It is therefore respectfully submitted that there would be no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the probe card of Horel et al. by (a) using a capacitor for the purpose of decoupling; or (b) by embedding the same in the resin insulation layer constituting the buildup interconnection layer.

The above amendments are believed to place the claims in proper condition for examination. Early and favorable action is awaited.

In the event that any fees are due in connection with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP


William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak
Atty. Docket No. 030868
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
Request for Continued Examination

Q:\HOME\AKERR\WLB\03\030868\prelim amendment oct 2005